UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SHARON PATERSON, No. 2:05-cv-00827-MCE-JFM
Plaintiff,
v. <u>AMENDED FINAL PRETRIAL ORDER</u>
CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF TRIAL DATE: March 3, 2008
GENERAL SERVICES, RAYMOND TIME: 9:00 a.m.
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC.,
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., Defendant.
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., Defendant. After reviewing the parties' Final Pretrial Statement, the
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., Defendant. After reviewing the parties' Final Pretrial Statement, the Court makes the following orders:
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., Defendant. After reviewing the parties' Final Pretrial Statement, the Court makes the following orders: I. JURISDICTION/VENUE
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., Defendant. After reviewing the parties' Final Pretrial Statement, the Court makes the following orders: I. JURISDICTION/VENUE Jurisdiction is predicated upon 28 U.S.C. sections 1331,
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., Defendant. After reviewing the parties' Final Pretrial Statement, the Court makes the following orders: I. JURISDICTION/VENUE Jurisdiction is predicated upon 28 U.S.C. sections 1331, 1343, 1367 and 42 U.S.C. section 2000e et seq. Jurisdiction and
ASBELL AND INTER-CON SECURITY SYSTEMS, INC., Defendant. After reviewing the parties' Final Pretrial Statement, the Court makes the following orders: I. JURISDICTION/VENUE Jurisdiction is predicated upon 28 U.S.C. sections 1331, 1343, 1367 and 42 U.S.C. section 2000e et seq. Jurisdiction and venue are not contested.

III. <u>UNDISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES</u>

- 1. Inter-Con Security Systems, Inc. is a private provider of security quard services.
- 2. Inter-Con is an employer within the meaning of the Fair Employment and Housing Act and Title VII.
- 3. Inter-Con contracts with the State of California to provide security guards services for certain state facilities.
- 4. Inter-Con employed Sharon Paterson from August 18, 2002 until her termination.
- 5. In November 2002, Paterson complained (first to the State, then to Inter-Con) that Alvin Jones (a janitorial supervisor employed by the State) sexually harassed her during October and November 2002.
- 6. After Paterson complained about Jones' conduct, Inter-Con removed her from that assignment.
- 7. Paterson began a leave of absence from Inter-Con in December 2002.
- 8. When she returned from her leave of absence in July 2003, Paterson was assigned by Inter-Con to work as a supervisor at parking facilities run by the State's Department of General Services ("DGS").
- 9. At the time of Paterson's assignment to DGS, Ray Asbell was a State employee whose responsibilities included overseeing the Inter-Con contract.
- 10. Paterson alleges that Asbell sexually harassed her. Asbell denied that he did so.

- 11. During her employment, Paterson never complained to anyone at Inter-Con about alleged harassment by Asbell.
- 12. On February 19, 2004, Paterson submitted a Pre-Complaint Questionnaire to the California Department of Fair Employment and Housing ("DFEH"). A true and correct copy of that Questionnaire is Exhibit RR as referenced in Defendant's Exhibit List.
- 13. On February 23, 2004, Paterson provided a written statement to the DFEH and filled out a supplement to her pre-complaint questionnaire. True and correct copies are referenced in Defendant's Exhibit List as Exhibits SS and TT, respectively.
- 14. In November 2002, Paterson complained (first to the State, then to Inter-Con) that Alvin Jones (a janitorial supervisor employed by the State) sexually harassed her during October and November 2002.
- 15. After Paterson complained about Jones' conduct, Inter-Con removed her from that assignment.
- 16. On October 1, 2003, Paterson was involved in an incident with Skip Evey, a State employee.
 - 17. Inter-Con suspended Paterson on October 6, 2003.
- 18. On the Employee Counseling Report documenting the suspension, Paterson apologized for her behavior, stated that she had acted unprofessionally, and admitted that she made a mistake.

26 ///

1 19. On October 7, 2003, Asbell (on behalf of DGS) wrote 2 Inter-Con demanding that Paterson be removed from the DGS

assignment.

20. On October 9, 2003, Inter-Con terminated Paterson's employment contending that it did so based upon Asbell's October 7, 2003 written request that Paterson be removed from the DGS contract assignment.

IV. <u>DISPUTED FACTUAL ISSUES</u>

The remaining claims for trial are:

A. Disputed Facts Relevant to Multiple Claims

- 1. Whether Inter-Con and DGS are "joint" employers of Paterson.
 - 2. Whether Asbell acted as Inter-Con's agent.
- Plaintiff contends that the following issues are also in dispute
- 3. Whether Inter-Con and DGS were Paterson's "dual" employers.
 - 4. Whether Asbell acted as Paterson's supervisor?
- 5. Whether Inter-Con's actions after Plaintiff filed a formal harassment and retaliation complaint about Alvin Jones' conduct would deter a reasonable person from reporting subsequent incidents of sexual harassment and retaliation?
- 6. Whether Inter-Con took immediate and appropriate remedial steps once it learned that Asbell had sexually harassed Paterson?

26 ///

7. Whether Inter-Con ratified Asbell's conduct by refusing to correct Plaintiff's termination after it learned that DGS had determined that Asbell had sexually harassed Paterson and lied about it.

B. <u>Disputed Facts Relevant to Plaintiff's Claims of Sexual Harassment in Violation of the FEHA and Title VII</u>

8. Whether Asbell sexually harassed Paterson.

Plaintiff contends that the following issues are also in dispute:

9. See #3-#7, above.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2.4

25

26

Defendant contends the following issues are also in dispute:

- 10. Whether Paterson has exhausted her administrative remedies as to this cause of action. (Plaintiff contends that the Court has already decided this issue as a matter of law.)
- 11. Whether Inter-Con reasonably should have known of alleged harassment by Asbell of Paterson.

C. <u>Disputed Facts Relevant to Plaintiff's Claims of Retaliation in Violation of the FEHA and</u> Title VII

12. Whether Inter-Con terminated Paterson in retaliation for her complaints of alleged harassment by Jones.

Plaintiff contends that the following issues are also in dispute:

13. See #3-#7, above.

Defendant contends that the following issues are also in dispute:

1	14. Whether Paterson has exhausted her administrative
2	remedies as to this cause of action. (Plaintiff contends that
3	the Court has already decided this issue as a matter of law.)
4	D. <u>Disputed Facts Relevant to Plaintiff's Claims of</u> Violation of the California Constitution
5	violation of the California Constitution
6	15. Whether Inter-Con terminated Paterson based on her
7	gender.
8	Plaintiff contends that the following issues are also in
9	dispute:
10	16. See #3-#7, above.
11	17. Whether Inter-Con terminated Paterson in retaliation
12	for her complaints of harassment by Jones.
13	E. <u>Disputed Facts Relevant to Plaintiff's Claims of</u> Violation of the Labor Code §1102.5
14	violation of the Labor Code \$1102.5
15	18. Whether Inter-Con terminated Paterson in retaliation
16	for her complaints of alleged harassment by Jones.
17	Plaintiff contends that the following issues are also in
18	dispute:
19	19. See #3-#7, above.
20	Defendant contends that the following issues are also in
21	dispute:
22	20. Whether Paterson's complaints to DGS personnel about
23	Jones in November 2002 constitute complaints to a government or

All issues of fact remaining in dispute are subject to

law enforcement agency within the meaning of the statute.

proof at the time of trial.

V. MOTIONS IN LIMINE

In limine motions shall be filed by **February 8, 2008**.

Opposition must be filed by **February 15, 2008** and any reply must be filed by **February 22, 2008**. In limine motions will be heard by the Court on **February 29, 2008, at 9:00 a.m**.

VI. TRIAL BRIEFS

The parties are free to brief any additional points of law necessary for resolution at trial. Counsel are directed to Local Rule 16-285 regarding the content of trial briefs. Trial briefs shall be filed by February 19, 2008.

VII. <u>WITNESSES</u>

Plaintiff anticipates calling the witnesses listed on Attachment "A".

Defendant anticipates calling the witnesses listed on Attachment "B".

Each party may call a witness designated by the other.

- A. No other witnesses will be permitted to testify unless:
- (1) The party offering the witness demonstrates that the witness is for the purpose of rebutting evidence which could not be reasonably anticipated at the Pretrial Conference, or
- (2) The witness was discovered after the Pretrial Conference and the proffering party makes the showing required in "B" below.
- 25 ///

26 ///

Upon the post-pretrial discovery of witnesses, the 1 В. attorney shall promptly inform the Court and opposing parties of the existence of the unlisted witnesses so that the Court may 3 consider at trial whether the witnesses shall be permitted to 4 testify. The evidence will not be permitted unless: 5 The witnesses could not reasonably have been 6 (1)discovered prior to pretrial; 7 The Court and opposing counsel were promptly 8 (2) notified upon discovery of the witnesses; 9 If time permitted, counsel proffered the 10 (3) witnesses for deposition; 11 If time did not permit, a reasonable summary of 12 (4)13 the witnesses' testimony was provided by opposing counsel. The parties shall provide an original and three (3) 14 С. copies of their proposed witness list. 15 16 VIII. EXHIBITS - SCHEDULES AND SUMMARIES 17 At present, Plaintiff contemplates by way of exhibits those

At present, Plaintiff contemplates by way of exhibits those listed on Attachment "C".

At present, Defendant contemplates by way of exhibits those listed on Attachment "D".

Plaintiff's exhibits shall be listed numerically.

Defendant's exhibits shall be listed alphabetically. The parties shall use the standard exhibit stickers provided by the Court: pink for Plaintiff and blue for Defendant.

///

26 ///

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

All multi-page exhibits shall be stapled or otherwise fastened together and each page within the exhibit shall be numbered. The list of exhibits shall not include excerpts of depositions which may be used to impeach witnesses.

Each party may use an exhibit designated by the other. In the event that Plaintiff and Defendant offer the same exhibit during trial, that exhibit shall be referred to by the designation the exhibit is <u>first identified</u>. The Court cautions the parties to pay attention to this detail so that all concerned, including the jury, will not be confused by one exhibit being identified with both a number and a letter.

- A. No other exhibits will be permitted to be introduced unless:
- (1) The party proffering the exhibit demonstrates that the exhibit is for the purpose of rebutting evidence which could not be reasonably anticipated at the Pretrial Scheduling Conference, or
- (2) The exhibit was discovered after the Pretrial Scheduling Conference and the proffering party makes the showing required in paragraph "B", below.
- B. Upon the post-pretrial discovery of exhibits, the attorneys shall promptly inform the Court and opposing counsel of the existence of such exhibits so that the Court may consider at trial their admissibility. The exhibits will not be received unless the proffering party demonstrates:

26 ///

(1) The exhibits could not reasonably have been discovered prior to pretrial;

- (2) The Court and counsel were promptly informed of their existence;
- (3) Counsel forwarded a copy of the exhibit(s) (if physically possible) to opposing counsel. If the exhibit(s) may not be copied, the proffering counsel must show that he has made the exhibit(s) reasonably available for inspection by opposing counsel.
- C. As to each exhibit, each party is ordered to exchange a copy identical to the Court's copy, or other reproduction of the exhibit(s) in a three-ring binder(s) by February 19, 2008. The attorney or representative for each party is directed to present the original exhibit(s) and two (2) copies for the Court. The exhibits should be delivered to the clerk's office on the fourth floor of this courthouse, to the attention of Stephanie Deutsch, Deputy Courtroom Clerk, no later than 3:00 p.m., February 19, 2008, or at such earlier time as may be ordered by the Court.
- D. The Court shall be presented with a copy of the exhibit(s) in a 3-ring binder(s) with a side tab identifying each exhibit by number or letter. Each binder shall be no larger than three inches in width and have an identification label on the front and side panel.
- E. The parties shall also provide a 3-ring binder(s), identical to the Court's copy, for use on the witness stand. $\ensuremath{///}$

F. The parties shall provide an original and three (3) copies of an exhibit list (corresponding to the marked exhibits).

IX. DISCOVERY DOCUMENTS

- A. <u>Filing Depositions</u>. It is the duty of counsel to ensure that any deposition which is to be used at trial has been filed with the Clerk of the Court. Counsel are cautioned that a failure to discharge this duty may result in the Court precluding use of the deposition or imposition of such other sanctions as the Court deems appropriate.
- B. <u>Use of Depositions</u>. The parties are ordered to file with the Court and exchange between themselves by **February 19**, **2008** a statement designating portions of depositions intended to be offered or read into evidence (except for portions to be used only for impeachment or rebuttal).
- C. <u>Interrogatories</u>. The parties are ordered to file with the Court and exchange between themselves by **February 19, 2008** the portions of Answers to Interrogatories which the respective parties intend to offer or read into evidence at the trial (except portions to be used only for impeachment or rebuttal).

X. FURTHER DISCOVERY OR MOTIONS

Pursuant to the Court's Pretrial Scheduling Order, all discovery and law and motion was to have been conducted so as to be completed as of the date of the Final Pretrial Conference.

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

That order is confirmed. The parties are free to engage in informal agreements regarding discovery and law and motion matters. However, any such agreements will not be enforceable in this Court.

XI. AGREED STATEMENTS - JOINT STATEMENT OF CASE

The parties shall submit a short, jointly-prepared statement concerning the nature of this case that can be read to the jury at the commencement of trial (NO EXCEPTIONS). The joint statement of the case shall include in plain concise language the claims of Plaintiff and claims of other parties, if any, and the corresponding defense to the claims. The purpose of the joint statement of the case is to inform the jury at the outset, what the case is about. The statement shall be provided to the Court by February 19, 2008 before the commencement of trial.

XII. PROPOSED JURY INSTRUCTIONS, VOIR DIRE, VERDICT FORM

A. Jury Instructions

Counsel are directed to meet and confer and to attempt to agree upon a joint set of jury instructions. Counsel shall use the Ninth Circuit Model Jury Instructions and any revisions.

Alternate instruction or authority may only be used if a Ninth Circuit Model Jury Instruction is unavailable. The joint set of instructions shall be lodged with the court clerk by February 19, 2008 and shall be identified as the "Jury Instructions Without Objection."

As to instructions on which there is dispute, the parties shall adhere to the following procedure:

- 1. The party offering contested instruction (s) shall submit the instruction(s) and a brief memorandum in support of the contested instruction(s).
- 2. The party shall number the contested instruction in a manner that shows where each contested instruction should be placed in the tendered joint instructions.
- 3. The contested instruction(s) and memorandum shall be filed with the joint set of instructions.
- 4. The party opposed to the contested instruction(s) shall submit a brief memorandum succinctly stating the legal basis of the objection(s) by **February 25, 2008**.

All instructions shall be, to the extent possible, concise, understandable, and free from argument. See Local Rule 51-163(c). Parties shall also note that any modifications of instructions from statutory authority, case law or from any form of pattern instructions must specifically state the modification by underlining additions and bracketing deletions, except in the "clean version" for use by the jury.

B. Verdict Form

The parties shall lodge a joint verdict form(s) concurrently with proposed jury instructions by **February 19**, **2008**. If necessary, a special verdict or interrogatories shall be included for all factual disputes submitted to the jury that must be resolved before questions of law can be decided, and for any other issue on which specific responses are desired. See Local Rule 51-163(e).

Where disagreement exists, the parties shall explain the disagreement and submit points and authorities supporting their respective positions by **February 25**, **2008**.

C. Voir Dire

The Court reserves the right to conduct all examination of prospective jurors. Notwithstanding this reservation, the Court will permit each side up to ten (10) minutes to conduct voir dire "for cause", if desired. The parties are directed to meet and confer and attempt to agree upon a joint set of proposed voir dire questions. The joint set of voir dire questions shall be lodged with the Court by February 19, 2008. Parties may also submit proposed voir dire questions which are disputed. Disputed voir dire questions shall also be lodged with the Court by February 25, 2008.

D. <u>Submission of Documents to the Court</u>

At the time of lodging their respective proposed jury instructions, verdict form(s), and voir dire questions, counsel shall also electronically mail to the Court in digital format and compatible with Microsoft Word or WordPerfect, the proposed jury instructions ("clean version"), verdict form(s), and voir dire questions. These documents should be sent to

22 mceorders@caed.uscourts.gov.

- 23 ///
- 24 ///
- 25 ///
- 26 ///

E. Failure to Participate

The failure of one or more of the parties to participate in the preparation of joint jury instructions, proposed verdict form(s), or voir dire questions does not excuse the other party or parties from their obligation to timely file these documents with the Court in accordance with this order. In the event of such failure, the party or parties timely submitting these documents shall include a declaration setting forth the reason for the lack of participation.

XIII. <u>AUDIO/VISUAL EQUIPMENT</u>

The parties are required to make a joint request, in writing to the Courtroom Deputy, Stephanie Deutsch, by February 11, 2008 if they wish to reserve and arrange for orientation with all parties on the Court's mobile audio/visual equipment for presentation of evidence. There will be one date and time for such orientation. Because each courtroom is not individually equipped with the mobile audio/visual equipment, the equipment may already be reserved for another courtroom. In such, case, the parties will need to consult with Ms. Deutsch if they wish to furnish their own equipment and operator with the permanent equipment in the courtroom.

XIV. DAUBERT/KUMHO PROCEDURE

Any motions based on <u>Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals</u>, <u>Inc.</u>, 509 U.S. 579 (1993) and/or <u>Kumo Tire Co. v. Carmichael</u>, 119 S. Ct. 1167 (1999) must be filed by **February 8, 2008**.

Case 2:05-cv-00827-MCE-JFM Document 91 Filed 09/25/07 Page 16 of 16

Oppositions must be filed by **February 15**, **2008** and any reply must be filed by **February 22**, **2008**. The motions will be heard by the Court on **February 29**, **2008**, at **9**:00 a.m.

XV. DATE AND LENGTH OF TRIAL

A trial is scheduled for March 3, 2008. The estimated length of trial is ten (10) days. The trial will consist of eight (8) jurors. Counsel are to call Stephanie Deutsch, Courtroom Deputy, at (916) 930-4207, by February 19, 2008 to ascertain the status of the trial date.

XVI. OBJECTIONS TO PRETRIAL ORDER

Each party is granted five (5) court days from the date of this Final Pretrial Order to object to any part of the Order or to request augmentation to it. A Final Pretrial Order will be modified only upon a showing of manifest injustice. If no objection or modifications are made, this Order will become final without further order of the Court and shall control the subsequent course of the action, pursuant to Rule 16(e) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 25, 2007

MORRISON C. ENGLAND, (R.)
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE